

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0112 f/k/a 35451/108 (Palm 3569.Palm)

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 30 and 41 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-51 are now pending in this application.

Elections / Restrictions

In section 2 of the office action, the Examiner indicated that there was a restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to three groups of claims:

- I. Group 1: Claims 1-26 are drawn to a method for converting content received from content server at the converting server for a handheld wireless device 709, subclass 246.
- II. Group 2: Claims 27-29 are drawn to a method for accessing and receiving content from a server by a handheld wireless device in class 709, subclass 203.
- III. Group 3: Claims 30-51 are drawn to a method for accessing and receiving content from remote, interconnected servers by a handheld wireless device in class 709, subclass 219.

As the Examiner indicated, a telephone call was made to me on August 2, 2004 to address the restriction requirement. Applicants chose to elect Group III (Claims 30-51). Applicants thereby now pursue claims 30-51 with claims 1-29 being withdrawn.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0112 f/k/a 35451/108 (Palm 3569.Palm)

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In section 10 of the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 30-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kanevsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947). The Examiner indicated that Kanevsky teaches all of the claim limitations of independent claims 30 and 41. Applicants amended independent claims 30 and 41 to clarify both the data flows in the system as well as the purpose of the system. What is taught in Kanevsky is simply a web page adaptor server in which the handheld or other device requests from a web site, the downloading of a web page. The web site sends the web page to the web page adaptor server which adapts the web page for the limited display screen size on the handheld or other device. The web page adaptor server then sends back the adapted web page to the handheld device or other device.

What Applicants recite in independent claims 30 and 41 is a system in which a handheld device operator sends a request through its first server on a network. The first server indicates the request for content from a second server. The second server is not the source however for the requested information. The second server is a server which may be designed to convert the content into content which is usable to a handheld device. For example, as is taught in paragraphs [0027], the second server may be a third party content software provider which writes software for creating the content. For example, the third party content software provider may be a provider of software for providing .doc files, .jpg files, or .pdf files. The handheld device does not have software which could access content which is not placed in a form that is usable by the handheld computer. Accordingly, the second server then sends the content request to a content source that retrieves the content from the content source and then formats the content from the content source into a form which could be used by the handheld computer. The handheld computer itself does not have software which could access the content unformatted. Therefore, the formatting is needed to access the content.

Accordingly, there are substantial and notable differences between Kanevsky and what Applicants have claimed in claims 30 and 41. First of all, is the data flows in which the first server sends a request directly to the website and the website sends the information to the web

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0112 f/k/a 35451/108 (Palm 3569.Palm)

page adaptor server. What Applicants have claimed is that the request is sent through the third party content software provider which determines whether the content being requested is something that they can handle. If it is, the request is then sent to the content source itself. Second, all that is taught by Kanevsky is the changing of web page size which will fit into the window size of the electronic device. The devices may already be able to handle the native web page, however, it may just be the fact that the display is not very friendly on the smaller display screen of the handheld device. For example, what Applicants have claimed in claim 30 is a situation in which the content may not be accessible at all by the handheld device unless that content is first reformatted by the third party content software provider.

Because all the claim limitations are not taught or suggested by Kanevsky, Applicants respectfully request that independent claims 30 and 41 and their respective dependent claims be allowed.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0112 f/k/a 35451/108 (Palm 3569.Palm)

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 15, 2004

By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5730
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,603